

REMARKS

In the Office Action of November 13, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 7-17 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Schroder (U.S. 4,563,271) in view of Timmermann (U.S. 5,740,920).

Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly define the structure of the invention and applicants submit that the references relied on by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the structure as clearly claimed.

Specifically, claim 7 defines a sieve jigger comprising a rocker mounted to pivot about a pivoting axis in the liquid bath. The Schroder device discloses a percussion jig which is “freely suspended in the region of its centroidal axis...[and]... there thus is no need for a separate pivot mounting point for the material carrier in the settling tub....The freely suspended material carrier of the percussion jig...moves to and fro in a straight line in the vertical direction.” Col. 1 lines 31-44. Thus, Schroder does not disclose a structure in which there is a rocker mounted to pivot about a pivoting axis in the liquid bath as required by claim 7.

Timmermann discloses a jiggling screen device which utilizes a pulsating water bath generated by supply and removal of compressed air. The support 13 for the settled material appears to be fixed in place, and there is no disclosure of a rocker mounted to pivot about a pivoting axis in the liquid bath. In view of this structural difference between claim 7 and the references, claim 7 is not rendered obvious by a combination of the references.

Claim 7 further defines a proportional control valve having a first lifting position in which the motor driven hydraulic oil pump is connected to the single working pressure chamber via the proportional control valve, a second free-fall position in which the single working pressure chamber is unrestrictedly connected to a hydraulic oil sump, and a third deceleration position in which the single working pressure chamber is closed off from the hydraulic oil pump and reservoir. Schroder does not disclose or suggest such a control valve. Timmermann similarly does not disclose or suggest such a control valve. In view of this structural difference

between claim 7 and the references, claim 7 is not rendered obvious by a combination of the references.

Further, claim 7 defines the operation of the device as including a first lifting phase, a second free-fall phase and a third deceleration phase as permitted by the defined structure.

Neither Schroder nor Timmermann disclose such an operation, nor the structure to perform such an operation. In view of this structural and operational difference between claim 7 and the references, claim 7 is not rendered obvious by a combination of the references.

In view of each of these reasons, taken separately and in combination, applicants submit that claim 7 and each of its dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the references relied on by the Examiner.

Claim 13 defines a sieve jigger comprising a rocker mounted to pivot about a pivoting axis located in the liquid bath. Schroder device discloses a percussion jig which is “freely suspended in the region of its centroidal axis...[and]...there thus is no need for a separate pivot mounting point for the material carrier in the settling tub...The freely suspended material carrier of the percussion jig...moves to and fro in a straight line in the vertical direction.” Col. 1 lines 31-44. Thus Schroder does not disclose a structure in which there is a rocker mounted to pivot and a pivoting axis in the liquid bath as required by claim 13.

Timmermann discloses a jiggling screen device which utilizes a pulsating water bath generated by supply and removal of compressed air. The support 13 for the settled material appears to be fixed in place, and there is no disclosure of a rocker mounted to pivot about a pivoting axis in the liquid bath. In view of this structural difference between claim 13 and the references, claim 13 is not rendered obvious by a combination of the references.

Claim 13 further defines a proportional control valve having a first lifting position in which the motor driven hydraulic oil sump is connected to the single working pressure chamber via the proportional control valve, a second free-fall position in which the single working pressure chamber is unrestrictedly connected to a hydraulic oil sump, and a third deceleration

position in which the single working pressure chamber is closed off from the hydraulic oil pump and reservoir. Schroder does not disclose or suggest such a control valve. Timmermann similarly does not disclose or suggest such a control valve. In view of this structural difference between claim 13 and the references, claim 13 is not rendered obvious by a combination of the references.

Further, claim 13 defines the operation of the device as including a first lifting phase with the control valve in the lifting position, a second free-fall phase with the control valve in the free-fall position and a third deceleration phase with the control valve in the free-fall or deceleration positioning accordance with a control signal from the governor. Neither Schroder nor Timmermann disclose such an operation, nor the structure to perform such an operation. In view of this structural and operational difference between claim 13 and the references, claim 13 is not rendered obvious by a combination of the references.

In view of each of these reasons, taken separately and in combination, applicants submit that claim 13 and each of its dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the references relied on by the Examiner.

Claim 18 defines a sieve jigger comprising a rocker mounted to pivot about a pivoting axis. The Schroder device discloses a percussion jig which is "freely suspended in the region of its controidal axis...[and]...there thus is no need for a separate pivot mounting point for the material carrier in the settling tub....The freely suspended material carrier of the percussion jig...moves to and fro in a straight line in the vertical direction." Col. 1 lines 31-44. Thus, Schroder does not disclose a structure in which there is a rocker mounted to pivot about a pivoting axis as required by claim 18.

Timmermann discloses a jiggling screen device which utilizes a pulsating water bath generated by supply and removal of compressed air. The support 13 for the settled material appears to be fixed in place, and there is no disclosure of a rocker mounted to pivot about a

pivoting axis in the liquid below. In view of this structural difference between claim 18 and the references, claim 18 is not rendered obvious by a combination of the references.

Claim 18 further defines a proportional control valve having a first lifting position in which the motor driven hydraulic oil pump is connected to the single working pressure chamber via the proportional control valve, a second free-fall position in which the single working pressure chamber is unrestrictedly connected to a hydraulic oil sump, and a third deceleration position in which the single working pressure chamber is closed off from the hydraulic oil pump and reservoir. Schroder does not disclose or suggest such a control valve. Timmermann similarly does not disclose or suggest such a control valve. In view of this structural difference between claim 18 and the references, claim 18 is not rendered obvious by a combination of the references.

Further, claim 18 defines the operation of the device as including a first lifting phase with the control valve in the lifting position, a second free-fall phase with the control valve in the free-fall position and a third deceleration phase with the control valve in the free-fall or deceleration positioning accordance with a control signal from the governor. Neither Schroder nor Timmerman disclose such an operation, nor the structure to perform such an operation. In view of this structural and operational difference between claim 18 and the references, claim 18 is not rendered obvious by a combination of the references.

In view of each of these reasons, taken separately and in combination, applicants submit that claim 18 and each of its dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the references relied on by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that all of the claims of the application are patentably distinguishable over the references of record and request the Examiner to indicate all claims as allowed and to pass the application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin W. Guynn/ (Reg. No. 29,927)
Kevin W. Guynn
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD
300 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606-6771
(312) 987-2187
Customer Account No. 24978